

REMARKS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 41-58 were examined, and all claims were rejected. Claims 41-47 and 50-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Craig et al. (USPN 6,757,708), hereinafter “Craig”; and claims 48 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig, as applied to claims 47 and 56, and further in view of “Web Services Description Language,” Curbera et al., March, 2001. Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, claims 41 and 50 have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 41-58 remain present for examination.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 41-47 and 50-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Craig. Applicants respectfully traverse the section § 102(e) rejections. The amended claims necessarily preclude a finding of a prima facie case of anticipation because the requirements of a prima facie case simply are not met. Indeed, a prima facie case of anticipation can only be met when the prior art reference teaches or suggests all the claim limitations. See, MPEP § 2131. Craig does not describe, teach or suggest: automatically generating the data exchange schema data, the data exchange schema data being separate from the data processing object or providing the data exchange schema data to a subsequent client process.

These aspects of the invention are described in detail in the application with reference to FIG. 8 and FIG. 9 and from page 20, line 12 through page 23, line 11. Specifically, embodiments of the present invention comprise, “a textual schema description in a data exchange

schema specification format . . . for specifying how schema descriptions for data being exchanged using XML are to be specified.” Page 23, lines 3-6. In further embodiments, the data exchange schema, “is used to specify the XML data within the packet payload body data.” Page 23, line 7. The data exchange schema data is a separate form of data from the executable objects. Page 21, line 21 – page 22, line 1 (“This compiler 322, and all of its modules 801-804, may generate other forms of data in addition to executable objects.”) The schema data may be stored in a library and then be provided to a client so that, “users may obtain these schema descriptions to determine the format and functions of the web services and corresponding input and output arguments.” Page 23, lines 10-11.

The Examiner has maintained his argument that Craig, on Col. 9, lines 5-40, teaches the data exchange schema data because the java bean is a container of object information that contains schema information. See, Office Action page 2, paragraph 5. Applicants have amended the claims to even more particularly differentiate the claims and wish to focus on this particular difference. However, Applicants assert that the other differences previously presented still differentiate the present invention as claimed, and Applicants reserve the right to file continuation claims on the related subject matter.

Craig provides two models for creating java beans. In the first model, Craig states that the bean is a “passive container for data.” Col. 9, line 7. The data is data extracted from a datastore and saved into the bean by a servlet, but no mention is made to object information. See, col. 9, lines 11-16. In the second model, the Java bean contains a method to access a backend data source. See, col. 9, lines 21-22. A JSP sets the bean’s input properties, executes the bean’s method, and accesses the bean’s output properties. Even in this model, Craig still

does not describe generating data exchange schema data in the bean, but simply teaches the setting or accessing of bean properties.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the beans contain data exchange schema data, the exchange data is part of the bean as Examiner explains, “the schema information are presented in java beans themselves.” Office Action, page 7. In contrast, the data exchange schema data, as claimed in the present invention, is separate from the executable data processing object. This difference allows the data exchange schema data in the present invention to be stored in a library and provided to a subsequent client process that is unfamiliar with the data processing object. Craig, as described by the Examiner, is unable to do so because the java bean that processes the data must be instantiated to access any exchange schema data. As such, the present invention as defined in the claims is a notable improvement over Craig because client processes may call and receive data from the data processing object without knowledge of the format or function of the input or output arguments of the object.

A subsequent request for the Java Bean in Craig would require the client process to already understand way the Java Beans and JSPs interact, i.e., the inputs required by each Java Bean, what services each Java Bean performs, and what output is sent back to the JSP. See, col. 9, lines 45-57 and specifically lines 46-53 (“The bean developer then communicates with the Web page designer as to what input properties of the bean must be set before the Web page invokes the bean's function, as well as the bean's output properties that will result from the bean executing, where the value of these output properties can then be embedded within the resulting Web page as dynamically generated content.”). Thus, Craig does not teach a data exchange schema to allow a user to determine the format and functions of the web services and corresponding input and output arguments but teaches away from it.

For at least the above reasons, Craig does not teach or disclose automatically generating the data exchange schema data, the data exchange schema data being separate from the data processing object or providing the data exchange schema data to a subsequent client process as claimed in amended claim 41 and amended claim 50. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and find claims 41 and its dependent claims 42-49 in a condition for allowance. Similarly, Applicants request the Examiner allow claims 50-58 as they are computer-readable medium claims with substantially the same limitations of the method claims of claim 41-49 and are likewise not anticipated by Craig for the same reasons.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding amendments and arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be

resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Tadd F. Wilson

Reg. No. 54,544

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

(303) 357-1651

Date: April 10, 2006

